

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/075,423	02/13/2002	Lawrence G. Reid JR.	00471/268588	7582	
7	590 09/23/2003				
Charles W. Calkins			EXAMINER		
Kilpatrick Stoc 1001 West Fou	irth Street		DEMILLE, DANTON D		
Winston-Salem	n, NC 27101	·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3764	6	
			DATE MAILED: 09/23/2003	DATE MAILED: 09/23/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	0
	10/075,423	REID ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Danton DeMille	3764	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a re within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	1.
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u> </u>		
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) Th	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowatelosed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims			is
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application	ď		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			
	WIT HOTH CONSIDERATION.		
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	alastian raquirament		
8) Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accept			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on		sapproved by the Examiner.	
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep			
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
 Certified copies of the priority document 	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in Ap	plication No	
Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bu See the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti			ion).
 a)	visional application has be	en received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Ir	ummary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
S. Patent and Trademark Office	ation Cummany	Part of Paner No	

Application/Control Number: 10/075,423

Art Unit: 3764

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-20, drawn to a therapeutic bag, classified in class 601, subclass 15.
- II. Claims 21-28, drawn to a method of making a therapeutic bag, classified in class493, subclass 51.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the therapeutic bag could be molded of one piece material.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: the tie-wrap straps of figure 2, the stretch wrap of figure 3, the first and second pair of tie strings not shown, and the zip-lock attachment mechanism recited in claim 3.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

ddd

16 September, 2003 (703) 308-3713

Fax: (703) 872-9302

danton.demille@uspto.gov

Danton DeMille Primary Examiner Art Unit 3764